

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

The drawings stand objected to because of the reasons noted in the Office Action, in response, Applicants have amended claim 16 to correspond to the verbatim language in the specification and have added reference numerals 52 and 53 to Figure 1 as per the Examiner's suggestion. In addition, a complete set of replacement sheets are attached which include the additional reference numerals on Figure 1 and additional lines showing the offset referred to in claim 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding drawing objections be withdrawn.

The specification stands objected to for reasons also relating to claim 16. In response, Applicants have amended claim 16 to correspond to the verbatim language in the specification. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 1-17 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 as supposedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the limitation of "a rotating shaft . . . being in contact with the driven member" is supposedly not disclosed in the written description. Applicants respectfully disagree, and refer the Examiner's attention to paragraph [26] of the original application, and especially the last sentence that states that "the concentric alignment surface 47 [of the rotor] and an outer surface of the rotating shaft 16 include a concentric alignment contact area 49". Applicants also refer the Examiner's attention to paragraph [36], especially at lines 13-16 where it states that "further, once the shaft 16 is received in the alignment portion 42 of the opening 20, the outer surface 48 of the shaft 16 preferably comes in contact with the concentric alignment surface 47 of the alignment portion 42". How can these portions of Applicant's original text not support a claimed limitation that the shaft is in contact with the rotor? In other words, these §112 rejections against claims 1 and 11 are clearly not well made and should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 8, Applicants have amended the specification to explicitly refer to the claimed parallel arrangement that was shown in the drawings as originally filed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this §112 rejection against claim 8 be withdrawn.

With regard to claims 20-22, Applicants acknowledge that the term "perpendicular" was mistakenly used instead of the proper term "parallel". Therefore, Applicants have amended the claims in this regard, and have amended the specification to explicitly refer to these claimed features that were shown in the application drawings as originally filed. Applicants request that these amendments be entered. In the event that the Examiner takes the position that the amendments to claims 20 and 22 will not be entered, Applicants respectfully request that those claims be cancelled so that Applicant need not pay an additional filing fee in order to change the word "perpendicular" to "parallel". In view of the amending changes made and arguments submitted, Applicants respectfully request that all of the §112, first paragraph, rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 8-10 and 21-22 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the Office Action. With regard to claims 8-10, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections are not well made because the only proper interpretation of the claim language in conformance with ordinary English syntax is to mean that the first and second planar contact areas are parallel to one another. However, in order to avoid any confusion in the future, Applicants have amended claim 8 to make this even more explicitly clear. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejections against claims 8-10 be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejections of claims 21 and 22, Applicants have amended the claims to make it clear that the claimed two planar contact areas includes the planar contact area introduced earlier in the respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding §112, second paragraph, rejections against claims 21 and 22 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) over Tang. Other than respectfully pointing out that the Tang fan suspension apparatus is not a pump nor a rotational coupling, Applicants are simply at a loss as to how to address the outstanding rejection. Applicants flatly reject the assertion that Tang could function as a pump under any circumstances. Since Tang neither shows what the Office Action asserts nor what Applicants have claimed, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn. Nevertheless, because the Examiner appears to be wed to the notion that the Tang fan suspension apparatus could also be fairly characterized as a pump, this issue might be better resolved before the Board in an appeal.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) over Matsumoto. Applicants respectfully disagree but have amended claims 1 and 11 to include the limitations of claims 2 and 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding §102(b) rejections be withdrawn.

Since the previous §102 and §103 rejections were not included in the final rejection, Applicants have interpreted their omission to mean that those rejections have been withdrawn. In the event that that was an error, Applicants respectfully request that the present amendment and response be entered and that a new Final Office Action be issued that includes all of the rejections currently pending in the present application.

This application is now believed to be in condition for allowance of claims 1, 3-11, 13-17 and 20-22. However, if the Examiner believes that some minor additional clarification would put this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (812) 333-5355 in order to hasten the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael B. McNeil
Reg. No: 35,949